

REMARKS

Claims 4 and 6-13 remain pending in the present application. Claim 5 has been cancelled. Claims 4 and 6 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cambio (U.S. Pat. No. 4,213,933). Claim 5 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 5 depended from Claim 4. Claim 4 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 5 and Claim 5 has been cancelled.

Thus, Applicants believe Claim 4, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claim 8, which depends from Claim 4, is also believed to patentably distinguish over the prior art. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cambio (U.S. Pat. No. 4,213,933) as set forth in Claim 4 above and further in view of JP 8-290464. Claim 7 depended from Claim 4. As stated above, Claim 4 has been amended and is now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus,

Claim 7 is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 5-6 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As stated above, the limitations of Claim 5 have been added to Claim 4, Claim 5's base claim. Claim 6 has been amended to depend from Claim 4.

Claims 9-13 are allowed.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 16, 2007

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg